

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 and 21-33 were previously pending. As noted above, claims 1, 13, 15, 17, 18, 27, 29 and 33 have been amended, claim 12 has been canceled. No new matter is added. Thus, claims 1-11, 13-19 and 21-33 are now pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application based on the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

I. **Claims 1-3, 7-13, 15, 18, 21-27, and 29-32 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 7-13, 15, 18, 21-27 and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,130,284 to Lee, et al. (hereinafter, “Lee”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0016493 to Kim, et al. (hereinafter, “Kim”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claimed features must be taught or suggested by the references and there must be some explicit reason to combine reference teachings. See *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

Lee and Kim, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the features recited by the claims. For example, claim 1 recites, among other subject matter, “a first modem processor operative to . . . receive a first message from the first wireless network to perform handoff to the second wireless network” and “a second modem processor operative to . . . exchange a second message with the second wireless network implementing a second radio access technology from 3rd Generation Partnership Project 2 (3GPP2) to establish a new call with the second wireless network, perform a call setup procedure with the second wireless network to establish the new call, and perform processing for the new call with the second wireless network, wherein the handoff is triggered by the first wireless network based on location information for the wireless device.” (Emphasis added). Independent claims 13, 15, 18, 27, 29 and 33 each include similar subject matter.

In making the rejection, the Examiner relies on Lee to disclose the feature wherein the handoff is triggered by the first wireless network based on location information for the wireless device. (See Office Action, page 7).

Lee, in col. 13, lines 27-30, discloses “the mobile station receives a message including information about the adjacent base stations from the async base station through a broadcast

channel.” However, Lee does not disclose or suggest “wherein the handoff is triggered by the first wireless network based on location information for the wireless device,” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added). In contrast, Lee discloses receiving information about the adjacent base stations. not triggering the handoff based on the location information for the wireless device.

Kim does not disclose the above features, and therefore, does not cure the above noted deficiencies of Lee.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 13, 15, 18, 27 and 29. Claims 2-3, 7-11, 21-26 and 30-32 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 18, respectively. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 2-3, 7-11, 21-26, and 30-32 are allowable at least for the reason that they depend from an allowable base claim, as well as the additional features recited therein.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-13, 15, 18, 21-27 and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Kim.

II. Claims 4-6, 14, 16, 19, and 28 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4, 14, 16, 19, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Kim in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0139184 to Singh, et al. (hereinafter “Singh”). Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Kim in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0203469 to Patel, et al. (hereinafter “Patel”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 4-6, 14, 16, 19 and 28 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 13, 15, 18, and 27, respectively, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Further, these claims separately recite a combination of subject matter this is not disclosed or suggested by any combination of the cited references.

Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 4-6, 14, 16, 19 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Kim in view of Singh.

III. Claim 17 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh in view of Lee, in further view of Kim. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously discussed, Lee and Kim do not disclose or suggest “wherein the handoff is triggered by the UMTS based on location information for the wireless device,” as recited in claim 17. Singh does not cure the deficiencies of Lee and Kim.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh in view of Lee, in further view of Kim.

CONCLUSION

In light of these remarks, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 6, 2009

By: 

Kristine Ekwueme, Reg. No. 56,344
Direct: 858.658.1901

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502